

ENTERED

January 02, 2024

Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

JEWELL THOMAS, §
§
Plaintiff, §
§
VS. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:22-CV-00162
§
§
LANETTE LINTHICUM, *et al.*, §
§
Defendants. §

**ORDER ADOPTING MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDATION
TO DENY PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR EMERGENCY INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

On September 12, 2023, United States Magistrate Judge Julie K. Hampton issued her “Memorandum and Recommendation to Deny Plaintiff’s Motion for Emergency Injunctive Relief” (D.E. 53). The parties were provided proper notice of, and opportunity to object to, the Magistrate Judge’s memorandum and recommendation. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); General Order No. 2002-13. No objections have been timely filed. The Court notes that Plaintiff has filed a new Motion for Emergency Injunctive Relief (D.E. 56), but that it is based on different grounds and thus is not construed as objections to the memorandum and recommendation.

When no timely objection to a magistrate judge’s memorandum and recommendation is filed, the district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record and accept the magistrate judge’s memorandum and recommendation. *Guillory v. PPG Indus., Inc.*, 434 F.3d 303, 308 (5th Cir. 2005) (citing *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1420 (5th Cir. 1996)).

Having reviewed the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth in the Magistrate Judge's memorandum and recommendation (D.E. 53), and all other relevant documents in the record, and finding no clear error, the Court **ADOPTS** as its own the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for emergency injunctive relief (D.E. 43) is **DENIED**.

ORDERED on January 2, 2024.


NELVA GONZALES RAMOS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE